Amendment to the Drawings

The attached Replacement Sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1 and 2. In the amended Figures, descriptive text labels have been added to the boxes of respective Figures 1 and 2. In addition, Figure 2 is now more clearly represented by the combination of FIG. 2A and FIG. 2B. Furthermore, a minor error in FIG. 2B has been corrected, wherein the "NO" decision arrow of block 218 has been re-directed from the top of block 218 to correctly emanate from the left-hand side of block 218.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS

By this amendment, Figures 1 and 2 and claims 1-12 and 15-19 have been amended. Claims 1-19 remain in the application. Support for the amendments can be found the specification and drawings, as originally filed, and as can be reasonably inferred from the same. Some claims where amended for clarification or to fix typographical errors. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Specification

The title of the invention was objected to as being not descriptive and imprecise. This objection is traversed for at least the following reason. As presented herein, the title has been amended to read "METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR BI-DIRECTIONAL SYNCHRONIZATION OF AUDIO/VIDEO CONTENT THROUGH PLAYLISTS" which more clearly indicates the invention to which the claims are directed. The objection to the title is now believed overcome.

The Drawings

The drawings stand objected to because they fail to show detailed descriptions in Figures 1 and 2 as described in the specification. This objection is believed overcome for at least the following reason. As presented herein, Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to include appropriate labels to the boxes contained in the respective figures. Support for the amendment to Figures 1 and 2 can be found in the specification at least on page 4, lines 14-15, 21-22 and 27-31; page 5, lines 9-13 and 17-29; and page 6, lines 1-13 and 17-20. Objection to the drawings is now believed overcome.

In the office action on page 3, paragraph number (4.), it is stated: "The drawings stand objected to because figure 2 shows label in different page with different illustration, It should be label with different figure number, such as 2A and 2B." As best understood, this objection is believed overcome for at least the following reason. An

overall representation of FIG. 2 has been added on Sheet 2 of 3 to show that FIG. 2 includes the combination of FIGs. 2A and 2B. The original legend FIG. 2 on sheet 2 of 3 has been changed to FIG. 2A. The original legend FIG. 2 on sheet 3 of 3 has been changed to FIG. 2B. Objection to the drawings is now believed overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As now presented, claim 1 has been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for "query" in the claim. The rejection of the claim 1, as well as claims 2-10 which depend from claim 1, is now believed overcome.

As now presented, claim 11 has been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis in the claim for the following limitations: "connection" and "transfer." In addition, the phrase "personal computer" has been replaced by "host device." The rejection of the claim 11, as well as claims 12-14 which depend from claim 11, is now believed overcome.

As now presented, claim 15 has been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for "query" in the claim. The rejection of the claim 15, as well as claims 16-19 which depend from claim 15, is now believed overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites a method for performing bi-directional synchronization between media content of a media player with media content of a host device through play lists, said method comprising the acts of:

detecting connection of the media player to the host device;

requesting, via a query from the host device, at least one play list from the

media player marked for synchronization;

responsive to results of the query, transferring from the media player to the host device said at least one play list marked for synchronization;

comparing time and date information of said at least one play list marked for synchronization with time and date information of corresponding play lists of said host device, said comparing producing comparison information;

determining which play lists are to be copied from the media player to the host device and which play lists are to be copied from the host device to the media player based on the comparison information; and

copying the determined play lists to perform the bi-directional synchronization.

As presented herein, Claim 1 has been amended primarily for overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Notwithstanding the same, Claim 1 clearly articulates the novel and non-obvious distinct features thereof, as discussed below.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Robbin et al. (US 2003/0167318, hereinafter referred to as "**Robbin**"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that

> *"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."*

Therefore, with respect to claim 1, to sustain this rejection the **Robbin** reference must contain <u>all</u> of the above claimed elements of the respective claim. However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the **Robbin** reference, the latter reference <u>does not</u> disclose a method for performing bi-directional synchronization between media content of a media player with media content of a host device through *play lists* that specifically includes "requesting, via a query *from* the *host device*, at least one *<u>play</u> <u>list</u> from* the *media player <u>marked</u> <u>for</u> <u>synchronization</u>*" and

"transferring … said at least one *play list marked for synchronization*" [*emphasis added*] as is claimed in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the **Robbin** reference and should be withdrawn.

In contrast, the **Robbin** reference discloses a different method of synchronization of media on a media player with a host computer in which synchronization can be performed in a two-way manner (see Robbin at paragraph [0031], lines 9-10) and in which comparison of player media information and host media information is performed using *media attributes* of the various media items (see Robbin at paragraph [0034], lines 1-3). The **Robbin** reference further discloses that "[e]xamples of such *media attributes* include bit rate, sample rate, equalization setting, volume adjustment, start/stop and total time (see Robbin at paragraph [0034], lines 10-12). The **Robbin** reference still further discloses that "if modification *dates* associated with respective files storing the media items were *different*, this difference in modification date *would not trigger* the copying of such media items from the host computer to the media player *when* the above-identified media *attributes match* [*emphasis added*] (see Robbin at paragraph [0034], lines 20-24). However, the **Robbin** reference does not disclose a method for performing bi-directional synchronization between media content of a media player with media content of a host device through *play lists* that specifically includes "requesting, via a query *from* the *host device*, at least one *play list from* the *media player marked for synchronization*" and "transferring … said at least one *play list marked for synchronization*" [*emphasis added*] as is claimed in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 2-10 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. The 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

With respect to claim 11, the same has been amended herein in a similar manner as with respect to the amendment to claim 1. Claim 11 is believed allowable over the **Robbin** reference for the reasons stated herein above with respect to overcoming the

rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 12-14 depend from and further limit independent claim 11 and therefore are allowable as well. The 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

With respect to claim 15, the same has been amended herein in a similar manner as with respect to the amendment to claim 1. Claim 15 is believed allowable over the **Robbin** reference for the reasons stated herein above with respect to overcoming the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 16-19 depend from and further limit independent claim 15 and therefore are allowable as well. The 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claims 1, 11 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-10 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 12-14 depend from and further limit independent claim 11 and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 16-19 depend from and further limit independent claim 15 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced. An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-19 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Balconi-Lamica/

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Edward Goodman, Reg. No. 28,613

Dated: August 18, 2009

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9611
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: US040083US2

ATTACHMENTS

a-32658.286